



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,174	03/26/2004	Suchit Kaura	ORCL-2003-139-01	7993
<div>7590 06/12/2007 WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP Third Floor Two North Market Street San Jose, CA 95113</div>			<div>EXAMINER AHLUWALIA, NAVNEET K</div> <div>ART UNIT 2166</div> <div>MAIL DATE 06/12/2007</div> <div>PAPER NUMBER</div>	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,174

Applicant(s)

KAURA ET AL.

Examiner

Navneet K. Ahluwalia

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/12/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Claims 1 – 22 are pending in this Office Action. After a further consideration and a thorough examination of the present application, claims 1 – 22 remain rejected.
3. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to claims 1 – 22 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that there is no teaching in Lord of the attribute containing the creation of the node specific object.

In response to Applicant's argument, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Lord teaches the attribute containing the creation of the node specific object in paragraphs 103 - 104. Paragraph 103 discloses the creation of a file/object with the default access control list inherited from the parent directory.

Applicant argues that there is no teaching in Lord of shared objects and node specific objects.

In response to Applicant's argument, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Lord teaches shared objects and node specific objects in paragraphs 0093 and 0072. Paragraph 0093 discloses the node being enabled in the cluster to share all of the files on the disk. Furthermore, Lord discloses in paragraph 0072 the specific node data structure for the file systems.

Claims 2 – 22 recite the same subject matter and for the same reasons as cited above the rejection is maintained.

Hence, Applicant's arguments do not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art of record. In light of the foregoing arguments, the 102 rejections are sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lord et al. ('Lord' herein after) (US 20030028514 A1).

Art Unit: 2166

With respect to claim 1,

Lord discloses a method of providing shared objects and node-specific objects in a cluster file system (Figure 3, Lord), said method comprising:

- providing to a particular shared object an attribute that indicates any object created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be designated as node-specific (page 6 paragraph 0096, Lord); and
- when a node causes a file system operation that is node-specific to be performed by accessing said particular shared object, performing said file system operation in an alternate directory corresponding to said node, wherein said alternate directory supports a node-specific object (page 6 paragraph 0100, Lord).

With respect to claim 2,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein said particular shared object is a container-type shared object (paragraphs 0035 and 0070, Lord).

With respect to claim 3,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein said particular shared object is a directory (Figure 7, paragraphs 0070 and 0084, Lord).

With respect to claim 4,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein said performing said file system operation in said alternate directory includes:

- associating a pointer with said particular shared object (paragraphs 0038, 0135, Lord);
- using said pointer to point to a table having alternate directory information for each node (paragraph 0135, Lord);
- if said alternate directory information for said node indicates that said alternate directory has not been created, creating said alternate directory for said node and updating said table with a location of said alternate directory (paragraphs 103, 123, Lord).

With respect to claim 5,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 1 wherein said file system operation that is node-specific includes creating one of a node-specific file and a node-specific directory (paragraphs 0096 – 0097, Lord).

With respect to claim 6,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 5 wherein said file system operation that is node-specific includes modifying one of said node-specific file and said node-specific directory (paragraph 0101, Lord).

With respect to claim 7,

Lord discloses the method as recited in claim 5 wherein said file system operation that is node-specific includes deleting one of said node-specific file and said node-specific directory (paragraphs 0079, 0143, Lord).

With respect to claim 8,

Lord discloses a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions stored therein for performing a method of providing shared objects and node-specific objects in a cluster file system (Figure 3, Lord), said method comprising:

- providing to a particular shared object an attribute that indicates any object created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be designated as node-specific (page 6 paragraph 0096, Lord); and
- when a node causes a file system operation that is node-specific to be performed by accessing said particular shared object, performing said file system operation in an alternate directory corresponding to said node, wherein said alternate directory supports a node-specific object (page 6 paragraph 0100, Lord).

With respect to claim 9,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 8 wherein said particular shared object is a container-type shared object (paragraphs 0035 and 0070, Lord).

With respect to claim 10,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 8 wherein said particular shared object is a directory (Figure 7, paragraphs 0070 and 0084, Lord).

With respect to claim 11,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 8 wherein said performing said file system operation in said alternate directory includes:

- associating a pointer with said particular shared object (paragraphs 0038, 0135, Lord);
- using said pointer to point to a table having alternate directory information for each node (paragraph 0135, Lord);
- if said alternate directory information for said node indicates that said alternate directory has not been created, creating said alternate directory for said node and updating said table with a location of said alternate directory (paragraphs 103, 123, Lord).

With respect to claim 12,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 8 wherein said file system operation that is node-specific includes creating one of a node-specific file and a node-specific directory (paragraphs 0096 – 0097, Lord).

With respect to claim 13,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 12 wherein said file system operation that is node-specific includes modifying one of said node-specific file and said node-specific directory (paragraph 0101, Lord).

With respect to claim 14,

Lord discloses the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 12 wherein said file system operation that is node-specific includes deleting one of said node-specific file and said node-specific directory (paragraphs 0079, 0143, Lord).

With respect to claim 15,

Lord discloses a system comprising:

- a cluster having a plurality of nodes, a mass storage device coupled to said cluster (Figure 3, Lord); and
- a cluster file system configured to automatically provide shared objects and node-specific objects to each node without duplicating shared objects when providing node-specific objects (page 6 paragraph 0096, Lord).

With respect to claim 16,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 15 wherein said cluster file system enables providing to a particular shared object an attribute that indicates any object created in said particular shared object from this point in time will be designated as node-specific (page 6 paragraph 0096, Lord), and wherein when one of said nodes causes a file system operation that is node-specific to be performed by accessing said particular shared object, said cluster file system performs said file system operation in an alternate directory corresponding to said node, wherein said alternate directory supports a node-specific object (page 6 paragraph 0100, Lord).

With respect to claim 17,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 16 wherein said cluster file system associates a pointer with said particular shared object (paragraphs 0038, 0135, Lord), wherein said cluster file system uses said pointer to point to a table having alternate directory information for each node (paragraph 0135, Lord), and wherein if said alternate directory information for said node indicates that said alternate directory has not been created, said cluster file system creates said alternate directory for said node and updates said table with a location of said alternate directory (paragraphs 103, 123, Lord).

With respect to claim 18,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 16 wherein said file system operation that is node-specific includes creating one of a node-specific file and a node-

specific directory (paragraphs 0096 – 0097, Lord).

With respect to claim 19,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 18 wherein said file system operation that is node-specific includes modifying one of said node-specific file and said node-specific directory (paragraph 0101, Lord).

With respect to claim 20,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 18 wherein said file system operation that is node-specific includes deleting one of said node-specific file and said node-specific directory (paragraphs 0079, 0143, Lord).

With respect to claim 21,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 15 wherein said particular shared object is a container-type shared object (paragraphs 0035 and 0070, Lord).

With respect to claim 22,

Lord discloses the system as recited in claim 15 wherein said particular shared object is a directory (Figure 7, paragraphs 0070 and 0084, Lord).

Art Unit: 2166

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Navneet K. Ahluwalia whose telephone number is 571-272-5636.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam T. Hosain can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Navneet K. Ahluwalia
Examiner
Art Unit 2166

Dated: 06/07/2007



HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER